

---

**From:** c.baima@verizon.net  
**Sent:** Monday, October 26, 2020 9:51 PM  
**To:** MORASH, MELANIE  
**Subject:** Commentary on Olin proposed plan

Dear Ms Morash,

Action is eagerly awaited on the Olin site: it has been ongoing without much constructive movement for far too long. My biggest concerns are that the plan cleans up rather than covers up, and that Olin and other prior or future owners be kept on the hook for their full responsibilities. Companies going out of business or ownership changing hands can result in communities having to accept attenuated results, and we have already witnessed Olin slow roll the process for decades. What is the possible impact on the execution of an interim or final plan in case of bankruptcy? In these difficult economic times it is not far-fetched to imagine as a possibility. The community is familiar with uncertainties related to different aspects of the site. Where is the evidence that the containment area is fully functional? If it is, why should the plan not be to dispose of any contaminated material within it before capping it? Would leveraging an existing site, on-location not be an economical option? The status of the "plume" and the questionable functionality of the slurry wall and the bedrock in containing the contaminants are well-known. Before selections among treatment alternatives are made, this knowledge must be acquired and shared with the community, or at least it must be provided for that these interim choices are fully changeable pending new information coming to light. When it comes to tradeoffs related to the number of pumping and treatment sites, I feel that cost should not be a criterion for selection of alternative. The community has been paying the cost since the 70's, and even moreso since we have had to close five town wells. Alternatives should be selected if their result will be restoration of the soil/water to pre-contamination conditions, and in the shortest possible time frame. Impact on the wetlands of the remediation activities is acceptable as long as they are later restored, because cleanup to target levels is impossible otherwise. In the choice of soil remediation, I feel that any soil that is contaminated should be removed other than that in the containment area to be capped. We need not rely on institutional controls when remediation is an option. The results of institutional controls, especially as time goes on and the property changes hands, are not nearly guaranteed, whereas remediation provides certain results. Finally, I know I am not alone in feeling that lately the goal of restoration of the aquifer to drinking-water condition has been conspicuously absent. This is the "claim to fame," if you will, of the site and should be specified as one a criterion for assessment of remediation options.

Thank you to you and the team working on this site,

Charles Baima  
[14 Kelley Road](#)  
[Wilmington, MA 01887](#)

Sent from AOL Mobile Mail  
Get the new AOL app: [mail.mobile.aol.com](mailto:mail.mobile.aol.com)